Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

961143 JAN 16 1997

No. ____ OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term 1996

LEAMINDA COKER,

Petitioner,

v.

JAMES P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, RAY WILLIAMS, GEORGE E. SUMROW, CLIFFORD HENDERSON, CHARLES MELTON, Individually and as Trustees of the IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, and IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, and the INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 716,

Respondents.

Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The Court Of Appeals
For The Fourth Judicial District
Bexar County, Texas; Cause No. 04-9500204-CV

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

VEDA A. MOORE
Counsel of Record

MOORE AND MOORE, P.C.
14141 Southwest Freeway
Suite 1500
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
(713) 242-2587
(713) 242-8224 – Telecopier
Counsel for Petitioner

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

95 PP

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

29 U.S.C. § 1132 (of ERISA) specifies persons empowered to bring a civil action under ERISA; § 1144 (ERISA's preemption clause) provides for preemption of state laws which relate to an ERISA Plan. The state court granted summary judgment dismissing Petitioner's case, which asserts only state law claims, on the grounds of complete ERISA preemption. Petitioner lacks standing to sue under § 1132 to enforce her claims under ERISA. The questions presented are:

1. Whether standing to enforce ERISA is a prerequisite to ERISA preemption.

2. If so, whether the state court's dismissal of petitioner's case violates petitioner's Fourteenth Amendment constitutional guarantee of due process of law and access to the courts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv

OPINION BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED 2

STATEMENT 4

A. Facts 6

B. Proceedings Below 11

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION 13

The Petition Presents Important Questions of Federal Civil and Constitutional Law 13

This case presents the important question of whether standing to sue under ERISA is a prerequisite to both subject matter jurisdiction and ERISA preemption. The case raises the important question of whether the state court's dismissal of petitioner's case, founded solely in state law, on the grounds of complete ERISA preemption violated petitioner's constitutional guarantee of due process and access to the courts where petitioner lacks standing to enforce her claims under ERISA 13

CONCLUSION 21

APPENDIX A 1a

APPENDIX B 12a

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

APPENDIX C 14a
APPENDIX D 16a
APPENDIX E 18a
APPENDIX F 20a
APPENDIX G 28a
APPENDIX H 31a
APPENDIX I 40a
APPENDIX J 42a
APPENDIX K 52a
APPENDIX L 57a
APPENDIX M 60a
APPENDIX N 65a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES:

Alexander v. Anheuser-Busch Companies, Inc., 990 F.2d 536 (10th Cir. 1993) 17, 18

Cathey v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 805 S.W.2d 387 (Tex. 1991), *cert. denied*, 501 U.S. 1232 (1991) 20

Curtis v. Nevada Bonding Corp., 53 F.3d 1023 (9th Cir. 1995) 14, 19

De Marco v. C & L Masonry, Inc., 891 F.2d 1236 (6th Cir. 1989) 13

Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. v. Bruch, 489 U.S. 101 (1989) 17

Giardono v. Jones, 867 F.2d 409 (7th Cir. 1989) 13

Goreman v. Life Ins. Co. of North America, 811 S.W.2d 542 (Tex. 1991), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 824 (1991) 19, 20

Grand Union Co. v. Food employers Labor Relations Ass'n, 808 F.2d 66 (D.C. Cir. 1987) 14

Gulf Life Ins. Co. v. Arnold, 809 F.2d 1520 (11th Cir. 1987) 14

Harris v. Provident Life and Accident Insurance Co., 26 F.3d 930 (9th Cir. 1994) 14

Hermann Hosp. v. MEBA Medical & Benefits Plan, 845 F.2d 1286 (5th Cir. 1988) 13

Ingersoll-Rand Company v. McClendon, 111 S.Ct. 478 (1990) 16

Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. v. Taylor, 481 U.S. 58 (1987) 18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Mitchell v. Mobil Oil Corp., 896 F.2d 463 (10th Cir. 1990) 14

Modern Woodcrafts Inc. v. Hawley, 534 F.Supp. 1000 (D.Conn. 1982) 15

Northeast Dept. ILGWU Health and Welfare v. Teamsters Local Union No. 229 Welfare Fund, 764 F.2d 147 (3rd Cir. 1985) 15

Peterson v. American Life & Health Insurance Co., 48 F.3d 404 (9th Cir. 1995) 14

Pressroom Unions-Printers League Income Sec. Fund v. Continental Assurance Co., 700 F.2d 889 (2d Cir. 1983) 13

Provident Life & Accident Ins. Co. v. Waller, 906 F.2d 985 (4th Cir. 1990) 13

Raymond v. Mobil Oil Corp., 983 F.2d 1528 (10th Cir. 1993) 17

Sabine Pilot Services, Inc. v. Hauck, 687 S.W.2d 773 (Tex. 1985) 5

Smith v. Hickey, 482 F.Supp. 644 (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 15

Warner v. Ford Motor Company, 46 F.3d 531 (6th Cir. 1995) 18

CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES:

U.S. Const. amend. XIV (Due Process Clause) 2, 20

29 U.S.C. § 186(c)(5) 6

29 U.S.C. 1002(7) 16, 17

29 U.S.C. § 1002(16)(A) 10

29 U.S.C. § 1002(21)(A) 10, 15

29 U.S.C. 1105(c)(1)(B) 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

29 U.S.C. 1132 ..... *passim*
29 U.S.C. 1140 17
29 U.S.C. 1144(a) 4, 6, 15, 18, 20

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Leaminda Coker respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals For The Fourth Supreme Judicial District of Texas in this case.[1]

OPINION BELOW

The judgment and opinion of the Fourth Court of Appeals (App. 1a-11a) is unpublished. The Order and Judgment of the state district court (App. 14a-17a) is not reported.

JURISDICTION

The Texas state district court entered its final judgment dismissing petitioner's case on October 31, 1994. App. 17a. The state court of appeals entered its judgment affirming such dismissal on February 28, 1996. App. 2a. Petitioner's Motion for Rehearing in the state court of appeals was denied on April 2, 1996. App. 19a. The Texas Supreme Court issued its Order denying review of petitioner's case on October 18, 1996. App. 12a. This petition is being filed within 90 days of the October 18, 1996 Order of the Texas Supreme Court denying review. The

[1] On October 18, 1996, the Texas Supreme Court, without opinion, denied Petitioner's Application for a review of the decision.

jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTE INVOLVED

Constitutional Provisions

U.S. Const. Amend. XIV (Fourteenth Amendment – Due Process Clause), reproduced in its entirety at App. 40a-41a, provides in pertinent part:

> Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Statutory Provision

Title 29 U.S.C. § 1132 ("ERISA"), reproduced in its entirety at App. 42a-51a, provides in pertinent part:

> (a) **Persons empowered to bring a civil action**
>
> A civil action may be brought –
>
> (1) by a participant or beneficiary –
>
> (A) for the relief provided for in subsection (c) of this section, or
>
> (B) to recover benefits due to him under the terms of the plan, to enforce his rights under the terms

of the plan, or to clarify his rights to future benefits under the terms of the plan;

(2) by the Secretary, or by a participant, beneficiary or fiduciary for appropriate relief under section 1109 of this title;

(3) by a participant, beneficiary, or fiduciary (A) to enjoin any act or practice which violates any provision of this subchapter or the terms of the plan, or (B) to obtain other appropriate equitable relief (i) to redress such violations or (ii) to enforce any provisions of this subchapter or the terms of the plan;

(4) by the Secretary, or by a participant, or beneficiary for appropriate relief in the case of a violation of 1025(c) of this title;

(5) except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, by the Secretary (A) to enjoin any act or practice which violates any provision of this subchapter, or (B) to obtain other appropriate equitable relief (i) to redress such violation or (ii) to enforce any provision of this subchapter;

(6) by the Secretary to collect any civil penalty under subsection (c)(2) or (I) or (1) of this section;

(7) by a State to enforce compliance with a qualified medical child support order (as defined in section 1169(a)(2)(A) of this title); or

(8) by the Secretary, or by an employer or other person referred to in section 1021(f)(1) of this title,

(A) to enjoin any act or practice which violates subsection (f) of section 1021 of this title, or (B) to obtain appropriate equitable relief (i) to redress such violation or (ii) to enforce such subsection.

Title 29 U.S.C. § 1144 ("ERISA"), reproduced in its entirety at App. 52a-56a, provides in pertinent part:

(a) Supersedure; effective date

Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the provision of this subchapter and subchapter III of this chapter shall supersede any and all State laws insofar as they may now or hereafter relate to any employee benefit plan described in section 1003(a) of this title and not exempt under section 1003(b) of this title. This section shall take effect on January 1, 1975.

STATEMENT

This case involves the issues of whether standing to enforce ERISA is a prerequisite to ERISA preemption, and if so, whether the state court committed reversible constitutional error in dismissing Petitioner's case where Petitioner lacks standing to enforce her claims under ERISA.

Petitioner "Coker" filed suit in state district court against her employer, an ERISA Plan, and her supervisors, the Plan trustees, alleging claims under state law

for wrongful discharge, breach of her employment contract, and conspiracy to wrongfully terminate her employment.[2] Coker also sued the Union for tortuous interference with her employment contract and asserted a claim against all defendants for intentional infliction of emotional distress.

Coker's claim of wrongful discharge is based on Texas common law pronounced in the Texas Supreme Court's decision in *Sabine Pilot Services, Inc. v. Hauck*, 687 S.W.2d 773 (Tex. 1985), which creates a public policy exception to Texas' employment-at-will doctrine by prohibiting an employer from discharging an employee for refusing to commit an illegal act, [i.e., an act violating a criminal law]. To support her wrongful discharge claim under *Sabine*, Coker alleged that she was fired for refusing to participate in conduct which was either illegal and/or because she investigated whether such conduct was legal.

The conduct involved the processing of unemployment loan applications for unemployment loans authorized by the Plan. The court of appeals concluded that an interpretation of the Plan was required to determine the validity of the unemployment loans made by the Plan trustees and therefore Coker's claims were preempted by ERISA. Coker argued that the unemployment loan process presented issues merely collateral to her wrongful discharge claim under *Sabine*. Coker complained that the trustees' conduct *in terminating her employment*, violated

---

[2] The opinion of the state court of appeals erroneously states [Coker claimed] that the trustees, her supervisors, "Conspired in approving [certain] loans" to plan participants. App. 5a.

Texas common law. Coker did not assert any breach of fiduciary duty claims against the trustees with respect to the loans. Moreover, the conduct of the trustees in firing Coker was not carried out as Plan fiduciaires but as Coker's employer.

Coker argued that she had no standing to enforce the claims under 29 U.S.C. § 1132, and sought no relief provided in § 1132. App. 23a. Coker does not meet any of the criteria required to bring a civil action under § 1132(a).

The court of appeals did not address Coker's arguments that she had no ERISA cause of action, (App. 25a), and that dismissal of her case by the state court violated her constitutional rights of due process of law and access to the court under both the state and federal constitutions. App. 25a-27a.

The opinion of the state court of appeals affirms dismissal of Coker's case on the grounds that her claims *relate to* an ERISA plan, thereby triggering ERISA's preemption clause under 29 U.S.C. § 1144.

A. Facts

At the time of her discharge in April of 1989, Coker was employed by an ERISA Plan; her formal job title specified in the trust instrument was Administrative Agent [to the trustees]. App. 65a.[3] Coker had been an office employee of the Plan for over seven years and had

---

[3] The Plan was created pursuant to a Taft-Hartley Trust under 29 U.S.C. § 186(c)(5) and was required to be administered jointly by management and Union trustees.

received several promotions. She alleged that in approximately 1988 she was the office manager of the Plan office and was given the job title of Administrator by the trustees. Petitioner alleged that she continued to perform her duties as the office manager of the Plan office until she was discharged by the trustees. (Rec. Vol. IV, pp. 913-915).

Coker's job duties are described in an excerpt from the Trust instrument. (Rec. Vol. I, p. 302). App. 65a. None of the duties listed empowered Coker with any discretionary authority over the Plan's assets or administration. The Trust instrument specifies that the *trustees shall administer* the Plan and *shall instruct* the Administrative Agent *on all disbursements of plan benefits*. (Rec. Vol. I, p. 302).

Coker's breach of contract claim was based on a written contract of employment which, among other things, provides that Coker could be terminated only for just cause. (Rec. Vol. I, pp. 88-193).

Defendant/trustee George Sumrow stated in answer to sworn interrogatories filed early in the litigation that Coker was terminated because of her poor performance as "office manager". (Rec. Vol. I, p. 85).

Coker's job duties included processing paperwork associated with loan applications submitted by Plan participants to obtain unemployment loans authorized by the plan. A Notice of changes to the pension plan was distributed to plan participants. (Rec. Vol. I, pp. 140; 951). The Notice contains new language added to the Plan by amendment which authorized the trustees to make unemployment loans to plan participants. The Notice, sent to

the plan participants, states in part that "The Trustees may approve an unemployment hardship loan to unemployed participants and all such loans shall be subject to approval by the Trustees." (Rec. Vol. I, pp. 140, 951). The Notice further states that a participant must furnish two documents with an unemployment loan application: (1) a verification from the Union that the applicant "has been unemployed for at least thirty days . . . ", and (2) a verification from the Texas Employment Commission that the applicant "had applied for and was eligible for" unemployment benefits. As stated on the face of the Notice, these two verifications were required *to apply* for a loan. (Rec. Vol. I, pp. 140, 951). The loan applications and the accompanying documents were collected by the Plan's office staff, including Coker, and submitted to the trustees who had sole authority to approve the loan application.

Shortly before she was terminated, Coker refused to accept an application for an unemployment loan submitted by a participant/union member who admitted to Coker that he was not unemployed. (Tr. Vol. I, pp. 28-29). The member became irate and Coker reported the incident to the Union's business agent. Later that day, the Union member met with the Union's business agent and then returned to the Plan's office with his loan application, and a sworn verification from the Union that he was unemployed. (Rec. Vol. I, p. 29). Coker knew the Union had falsely verified that the member was unemployed.

After the incident, Coker investigated the files and discovered that many union members/plan participants had obtained unemployment loans without furnishing

the required verifications and/or by filing false verifications from the Union (that the member was unemployed). (Rec. Vol. I, pp. 28-29). Coker reported this information to the Union's business agent and to George Sumrow, a trustee, as well as the Union's attorney. She also requested that she be instructed on whether she should accept loan applications submitted by union members who were not unemployed and/or who did not furnish the documents specified in the Notice, or who furnished false verifications, from the Union. (Rec. Vol. I, pp. 28-31). None of the trustees or the attorney for the Plan instructed Coker on the matter as she requested. Coker believed it was illegal for her to accept false sworn verifications in support of loan applications. Coker did not claim that the Plan did not authorize the trustees to make unemployment loans, rather she objected to accepting loan applications based on false verifications of unemployment and/or not accompanied by the two documents specified in the Notice.

Defendants offered no evidence that Coker had any discretionary authority with respect to the assets or administration of the Plan; moreover, the record contains support to the contrary. The record contains no evidence that Coker had any discretion to act independently of the trustee's instructions in matters relating to the Plan's assets and administration. *See* (Rec. Vol. I, pp. 29, 302); (Rec. Vol. IV, p. 947 [a letter to Coker from the Board of Trustees advising Coker that the Administrator was an employee-at-will of the Plan]); (Appellant's Brief at p. 13, note 7); (Supp. Rec. 31 – Coker testified at deposition that after she was given the title of "Administrator", her job duties remained the same); (Supp. Rec. 45-47 – Coker

testified in deposition that the administrator [position] was [the same as] that of office manager).

Coker argued in the court of appeals that defendants had produced no summary judgment evidence to support their affirmative defense of ERISA preemption of Coker's case and challenged Respondents' characterization of her as an [ERISA] administrator. (Appellant's Reply Brief. at p. 8). (Supp. Rec., p. 38 – Coker's deposition testimony that she could not do anything [with respect to administration of the Plan] without the approval [instruction] of the trustees). Respondents did not produce, and the record does not contain any evidence to establish that Coker's position or duties fall under 29 U.S.C. § 1002(16)(A) (ERISA definition of administrator) or 29 U.S.C. § 1002(21)(A) (ERISA fiduciary).

Coker instructed another employee in the office not to accept unemployment loan applications. (Rec. Vol. I, p. 30). The office employee Coker instructed was a long-time friend of a Union agent who was also a trustee of the Plan. When this employee disregarded Coker's instructions, Coker complained to the trustees and recommended that the employee be terminated. The trustees immediately discharged Coker instead. (Rec. Vol. IV, p. 924).

Coker sought recovery of a money judgment against Respondents, including claims for monetary damages for lost wages, interest, mental distress and for punitive damages; she also sought recovery of attorney's fees in connection with her breach of contract claims. Coker sought no equitable relief under ERISA.

B. Proceedings Below

Coker filed suit in state court on April 3, 1990; her complaint alleges claims under state law for wrongful discharge, breach of contract, tortuous interference by the Union with her employment contract, conspiracy and intentional infliction of emotional distress. (Rec. Vol. IV, pp. 910-952). Respondents asserted the affirmative defense of ERISA preemption and early in the litigation filed a Plea to the Jurisdiction [of the state court], or Alternatively for Summary Judgment. (Rec. Vol. I, pp. 46-49). The Plea was denied by the state court. (Rec. Vol. I, p. 13). Respondents later removed the case to federal district court on the grounds of federal question jurisdiction. Coker filed a Motion to Remand her case to state court. In response, Respondents claimed that the federal statute which Coker furnished to support her claim under *Sabine* was evidence that Coker's claims were preempted by ERISA thereby invoking federal question jurisdiction. App. 60a-64a. The federal district court granted Petitioner's Motion to Remand and entered a Remand Order stating in part that Coker's case did not arise under federal law and Coker's "claim as a whole . . . is in essence one under state law." App. 58a.

Following remand, defendants again moved for summary judgment in the state district court on the grounds of ERISA preemption. The state court entered an interlocutory Order dismissing Coker's case against her employer the Plan, and the individual trustees based upon ERISA preemption, App. 14a-15a. The Union then sought to be included in the judgment of dismissal and the state court entered a Final Judgment dismissing

Coker's case against all defendants based upon ERISA preemption. App. 16a-17a.

Coker appealed from the state court judgment. The state court of appeals affirmed the trial court's dismissal of Coker's case and held that "because the inquiry must necessarily be directed to the underlying ERISA plan and its rules and regulations, plaintiff's state causes of action . . . " relate to the ERISA benefit plan and are preempted by ERISA. App. 11a. The court of appeals did not address Coker's arguments that she had no ERISA cause of action or standing to enforce her claims under ERISA. The opinion of the court of appeals states that ERISA preemption was not raised in the removal proceeding however, a copy of Respondents' opposition to Coker's Motion for Remand in which Respondents argued ERISA preemption was before the court of appeals. (Appellant's Reply Brief, Appendix 2); (Appellant's Reply Brief, pp. 8-14 – where Coker argues that the federal court's Remand Order impliedly rejected Respondents' ERISA preemption argument). The court of appeals denied Coker's Motion for Rehearing, App. 18a-19a.

Coker sought review of the opinion of the court of appeals in the Texas Supreme Court, claiming that she had no ERISA cause of action, [*i.e.*, no standing to enforce her claims under ERISA in federal court], and that the effect of the lower court decisions violated her state and federal constitutional guarantees of due process and access to the courts. App. 32a-37a. The Texas Supreme Court declined to review Coker's case. App. 12a-13a.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. The Petition Presents Important Questions of Federal Civil and Constitutional Law

This case presents the important question of whether standing to sue under ERISA is a prerequisite to both subject matter jurisdiction and ERISA preemption. The case thus also raises the important question of whether the state court's dismissal of petitioner's case, founded solely in state law, on the grounds of complete ERISA preemption violated petitioner's constitutional guarantee of due process and access to the courts where petitioner lacks standing [under ERISA] to enforce such claims in federal court.

The list of plaintiffs with standing to sue under ERISA's enforcement provisions set forth in 29 U.S.C. § 1132 [ERISA] is exclusive. See, *e.g., Pressroom Unions-Printers League Income Sec. Fund v. Continental Assurance Co.*, 700 F.2d 889, 892 (2d Cir. 1983) (Congress did not "intend [ ] . . . to grant subject matter jurisdiction over suits by employers, funds or other parties not listed in [§ 1132];" *Provident Life & Accident Ins. Co. v. Waller*, 906 F. 2d 985, 987 (4th Cir. 1990) (standing under ERISA should be limited only to those parties enumerated in § 1132); *Hermann Hosp. v. MEBA Medical & Benefits Plan*, 845 F.2d 1286, 1288-89 (5th Cir. 1988) ("Where Congress has defined the parties who may bring a civil action founded on ERISA, we are loathe to ignore the legislature's specificity"); *De Marco v. C & L Masonry, Inc.*, 891 F.2d 1236, 1241 (6th Cir. 1989) (holding that an employer did not have standing to sue a Trustee for breach of a fiduciary duty owed to the beneficiaries of the plan); *Giardono v. Jones*, 867 F.2d 409, 413 (7th Cir. 1989) (holding that courts

are without the power to expand their jurisdiction under ERISA in order to imply a cause of action for non-enumerated parties); *Grand Union Co. v. Food Employers Labor Relations Ass'n*, 808 F.2d 66 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (holding that an employer was not eligible to sue); *Mitchell v. Mobil Oil Corp.*, 896 F.2d 463, 473 (10th Cir. 1990) (holding that although [ERISA] has a broad remedial purpose, only participants, beneficiaries, and fiduciaries . . . may avail themselves of its protections); *Gulf Life Ins. Co. v. Arnold*, 809 F.2d 1520, 1524 (11th Cir. 1987) (holding that "[ERISA's] standing provisions must be construed narrowly; civil actions under ERISA are limited only to those parties and actions Congress specifically enumerated in section 1132").

In *Curtis v. Nevada Bonding Corporation*, 53 F.3d 1023, 1026 (9th Cir. 1995), the court holds that without standing to enforce ERISA, there can be no ERISA preemption. Standing is a prerequisite to both subject matter jurisdiction and ERISA preemption. *Id.* at 1027, (citing *Peterson v. American Life & Health Insurance Co.*, 48 F.3d 404, 409 (9th Cir. 1995); see *Harris v. Provident Life and Accident Insurance Co.*, 26 F.3d 930 (9th Cir. 1994) (holding that it would be contradictory to rule that state law claims are preempted where the court has already held that the same plaintiffs may not assert a claim under ERISA because they [lack standing].

Coker did not assert any claims that give her standing under § 1132. (Rec. Vol. IV, pp. 910-952). Respondents did not address Coker's arguments that she lacked standing to enforce her claims under ERISA.

Moreover, the opinion of the court of appeals acknowledges that, Coker did not assert a cause of action under ERISA. (App. 3a).

The crux of Respondent's preemption argument was that Coker was the "Administrator" of an ERISA Plan with claims that called for an interpretation of the Plan thereby invoking § 1144 (preemption). Respondents relied on cases where the plaintiff was clearly an ERISA qualfied administrator under 29 U.S.C. § 1002(21)(A), i.e., a fiduciary of an ERISA plan with discretion over the assets and administration of the Plan; Respondents also relied on cases where plaintiffs had standing to enforce ERISA under § 1132.

Conversly, Coker was not a plan fiduciary under § 1002(21)(A) or § 1132. Moreover, in order to have standing to sue under ERISA as a "fiduciary," a party must be (or have been) a fiduciary of the plan *whose other fiduciaries are being sued for breach of duty.*" [emphasis supplied]. *Modern Woodcrafts, Inc. v. Hawley,* 534 F. Supp. 1000, 1014 (D. Conn. 1982) (holding that a person is a fiduciary with respect to a plan to the extent (i) he exercises any discretionary authority or discretionary control respecting the management of such plan or exercise authority or control respecting management or disposition of [the Plan's] assets, (ii) renders investment advice for a fee . . . or (iii) he has any discretionary authority or discretionary responsibility in the administration of such plan); *Smith v. Hickey,* 482 F. Supp. 644, 650 (S.D.N.Y. 1979); *Northeast Dept. ILGWU Health and Welfare v. Teamsters Local Union No. 229 Welfare Fund,* 764 F.2d 147, 154 (3d Cir. 1985) (holding at p. 153 that § 1132 must be read narrowly or literally . . . such a reading precludes the interpretation

that a pension fund or a trustee (fiduciary) of a fund can sue under § 1132(a)(1)(B) on behalf of participants or beneficiaries; also holding at p. 155 that Section 1132(a)(3) contemplates fiduciaries **suing to enforce the terms of the plan,** meaning the terms of the plan regarding which they have a fiduciary duty). [emphasis supplied].

Persons defined as fiduciaries under 29 U.S.C. § 1105(c)(1)(B), are persons designated by named fiduciaries . . . to carry out fiduciary responsibilities (**other than trustee responsibilities**), [emphasis supplied], under the plan. Coker's job description specifies that she was to assist the trustees *in carrying out the trustees' responsibilities* under the plan. ERISA's definition of "fiduciary" thus expressly excludes Coker. Moreover, Respondents did not challenge Coker's claims that she lacked discretionary authority over the assets or administration of the Plan and the court of appeals did not address the matter. Coker had no standing to sue under ERISA as a fiduciary.

The opinion of the state court of appeals ignores Coker's argument that she lacks standing to enforce ERISA. Respondents did not address such argument in their responsive briefs and argued that ERISA preemption applied because the Plan had to be interpreted to determine if the trustees were authorized to make the unemployment loans under the terms of the Plan.

In dismissing Coker's case, both the trial court and the state court of appeals rely upon this Court's decision in *Ingersoll-Rand Company v. McClendon,* 111 S. Ct. 478, reversing a decision of the Texas Supreme Court, and

holding that ERISA preempted a wrongful discharge claim by an employee that his employer fired him to prevent him from obtaining pension benefits under his employer's ERISA plan. Significantly, the claim asserted by the plaintiff in *Ingersoll-Rand* falls squarely under § 1140 of ERISA which prohibits, among other things, the discharge of an employee for the purpose of interfering with the attainment of any right to which the employee, **as a plan participant**, may become entitled under the plan. Moreover, this Court noted in *Ingersoll-Rand* that ERISA provides an **exclusive** remedy for an employer's conduct in violation of § 1140. (Emphasis supplied). At oral arguments before this Court [and as stated in the Court's opinion], the employer's pension defeating motive in the termination was a significant factor. Moreover, the plaintiff in *Ingersoll-Rand* had standing to sue under § 1132 as a "plan participant". In *Alexander v. Anheuser-Busch Companies, Inc.*, 990 F.2d 536 (10th Cir. 1993), the court sets forth the criteria to qualify as a "participant" within the meaning of § 1132 as follows:

> . . . To be a "participant," a plaintiff must either be (1) an employee in, or reasonably expected to be in, currently covered employment; (2) a former employee with a reasonable expectation of returning to covered employment; (3) **a former employee with a colorable claim that he will prevail in a suit for benefits**; or (4) a former employee with a colorable claim that eligibility requirements will be fulfilled in the future. *Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. v. Bruch*, 489 U.S. 101, 117-18, 109 S.Ct. 948, 957-58, 103 L.Ed.2d 80 (1989); *Raymond*, 983 F.2d at 1532-33; 29 U.S.C. § 1002(7). [Emphasis supplied].

McClendon's claim clearly falls under items (3) and (4) in above quoted excerpt from *Alexander*. Conversely, Coker does not meet any of the criteria specified above.

Coker argued that the federal district court's remand of her case impliedly rejected defendants' ERISA preemption argument. (Rec. Vol. II, pp. 524-526); (Appellant's Brief pp. 34-37; Appellant's Reply Brief pp. 8-14). See also App. 24a, 26a, 38a. This Court has held that an ERISA preemption defense confers both subject matter and removal jurisdiction, despite the general rule that a federal question must appear on the face of the complaint. *Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. v. Taylor*, 481 U.S. 58, 107 S.Ct. 1542, 95 L.Ed. 2d 55 (1987). Section 1144 [preemption clause of ERISA] allows ERISA to preempt state laws when they "relate to" matters governed by ERISA but that section of the statute does not create a federal cause of action for matters which only "relate to" ERISA's field of concern. *Warner v. Ford Motor Company*, 46 F.3d 531, 534 (6th Cir. 1995). In Coker's case, the matters the Court of Appeals finds to "relate to" an ERISA plan are more properly described as matters concerning ERISA's field of concern. However, the court's finding does not create federal subject matter jurisdiction over Coker's claims. *Id.* at 534.

The opinion of the court of appeals states that "because an inquiry must necessarily be directed to the underlying ERISA plan and its rules and regulations, plaintiff's **state causes of action** . . . **relate to** the ERISA benefit plan and are preempted by ERISA". [Emphasis supplied]. App. 11a. However, this finding ignores ERISA's standing requirement. ERISA preemption under § 1144 is not triggered *solely* because an inquiry must be directed to the underlying ERISA plan if the plaintiff's

claim is not subject to enforcement under ERISA. *Curtis v. Nevada Bonding Corporation, supra,* 53 F.3d at 1026-27 (standing is a prerequisite to both subject matter jurisdiction and ERISA preemption. Therefore, the state court's dismissal of Coker's claims, affirmed by the court of appeals, violates Coker's constitutional guarantee of due process of law and access to the courts.

The unsettled nature of ERISA's preemptive scope is evidenced by the decision of the state court of appeals in this case. The court quotes from *Goreman v. Life Ins. Co. of North America,* 811 S.W.2d 542, 545 (Tex. 1991), *cert. denied,* 502 U.S. 824 (1991), where the Texas Supreme Court finds that the state court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims ***for breach of fiduciary duty.*** [Emphasis supplied]. Those claims fell directly under federal subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to § 1132 [of ERISA]. *Goreman* at p. 547. However, the court in *Goreman* recharacterized the plaintiff's breach of contract claim as a claim for benefits under the plan thereby conferring the state court's concurrent jurisdiction over a claim for benefits under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B). *Goreman* at p. 546, n. 5. The contract claim in *Goreman* was based on a claim for plan benefits under an insurance policy that formed part of an employee benefit plan. Therefore, the court's analysis of the plaintiffs' standing under § 1132 in *Goreman* should have made it obvious to the court of appeals that Coker's claims were not subject to state or federal subject matter jurisdiction [under ERISA] and therefore ERISA's preemption clause would not apply to Coker's case at all.

Instead, the court of appeals, without addressing the fact that Coker's case did not involve *any* claim enforceable

under § 1132 [unlike the claims asserted by the plaintiff in *Goreman*], finds [by implication] that federal subject matter jurisdiction applies to Coker's case under ERISA because it finds that Coker's claims come within ERISA's preemption clause [§ 1144]. The court then misapplies this Court's analysis in *Ingersoll-Rand*, as quoted in *Cathey v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 805 S.W.2d 387, 389 (Tex. 1991), *cert. denied*, 501 U.S. 1232 (1991), and holds that state laws having an effect on employee benefit plans relate to such plans, and given the breadth of the preemption clause "state laws found to be beyond the scope of the preemption provision are few." App. 8a. The effect of the court's holding is that federal subject matter jurisdiction is invoked if a claim meets the criteria of § 1144 for preemption.

In the case, the state court's improper interpretation of the jurisdictional requirements of ERISA deprives Coker of her constitutional guarantee of due process of law in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Review of the decision below is important because of the confusion which exists over the jurisdiction requirements of ERISA under § 1132. This case presents the opportunity for this Court to address the issue and bring much needed certainty and uniformity to this area of ERISA by holding that standing under ERISA is a prerequisite to both subject matter jurisdiction and ERISA preemption. Without this Court's clarification of the Act's jursidictional requirements under § 1132, improper extension of ERISA preemption by state courts will continue to burden the federal system with cases such as the one presented now.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons certiorari should be granted and this case should be accepted for plenary review. In the alternative, certiorari should be granted and the decision below vacated and remanded to the state appeals court with instructions to reverse the state court's dismissal of Coker's case on the grounds of ERISA preemption.

Respectfully submitted,

VEDA A. MOORE
(Attorney in Charge)
MOORE AND MOORE, P.C.
14141 Southwest Freeway
Suite 1500
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
(281) 242-2587
(281) 242-8224 – Telecopier
Attorneys for Petitioner

January 1997

APPENDIX A

JUDGMENT
COURT OF APPEALS
FOURTH COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Court of Appeals

Fourth Court of Appeals District of Texas

San Antonio

[SEAL]

JUDGMENT

Appeal No. 04-95-00204-CV

Leaminda COKER,
Appellant,

v.

James P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, Ray WILLIAMS, George E. SUMROW, Clifford HENDERSON, Charles MELTON, Individually and as Trustees of the IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716, and IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 716, Appellees.

Appeal from the 164th District Court of Harris County
Trial Court No. 90-016254
Honorable Katie Kennedy, Judge Presiding

BEFORE JUSTICE LÓPEZ, JUSTICE GREEN AND JUSTICE BUTTS[1]

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, the judgment of the trial court is AFFIRMED. It is ORDERED that appellees, James P. Douglas, A.A. Cook, Ray Williams, George E. Sumrow, Clifford Henderson, Charles Melton, IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716, and

---

[1] Assigned to this case by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Texas pursuant to TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 74.003(b) (Vernon 1988).

the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 716, recover their costs of this appeal from appellant Leaminda Coker and from the cash deposit in lieu of cost bond. After all costs have been paid, the clerk of the district court is directed to release the balance, if any, of the cash deposit to Veda Moore as attorney for appellant Leaminda Coker.

SIGNED February 28, 1996.

ALMA L. LÓPEZ, JUSTICE

Court of Appeals

Fourth Court of Appeals District of Texas

San Antonio

[SEAL]

OPINION

Appeal No. 04-95-00204-CV

Leaminda COKER,
Appellant,

v.

James P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, Ray WILLIAMS, George E. SUMROW, Clifford HENDERSON, Charles MELTON, Individually and as Trustees of the IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716, and IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 716, Appellees.

Appeal from the 164th District Court of Harris County
Trial Court No. 90-016254
Honorable Katie Kennedy, Judge Presiding

Opinion by: Shirley W. Butts, Justice[1]

Sitting: Alma L. López, Justice
Paul W. Green, Justice
Shirley W. Butts, Justice

Delivered and Filed: February 28, 1996

AFFIRMED

Leaminda Coker, plaintiff below, appeals a summary judgment in favor of defendants, James P. Douglas, A.A. Cook, Ray Williams, George E. Sumrow, Clifford Henderson, and Charles Melton, individually and as Trustees of the IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716, and IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 716.

The case involves the plaintiff/employee Coker's allegations of wrongful termination, breach of employment contract, tortious interference with contract, emotional distress based on outrageous conduct, and conspiracy to interfere with contractual relations. Following the initial claim of wrongful termination, the remaining causes of action alleged by plaintiff all derive from that. She made no claim under ERISA.

The trial court granted summary judgment declaring that (1) no conduct of any defendant was outrageous as a matter of law; and (2) all other claims by plaintiff are

---

[1] Assigned to this case by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Texas pursuant to TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 74.003(b) (Vernon 1988).

preempted by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) 29 U.S.C. §§ 1001-1461 (1988). The court entered a take-nothing judgment against plaintiff. We affirm.

Plaintiff brings seven points of error. The first two address the tortious interference with the contract claim. In point two, plaintiff asserts the court erred in ruling the defendants' conduct was not outrageous as a matter of law. Next, it is argued the court erred in holding that the contract of employment did not apply to her at the time of discharge. Point five is that the law of the case applies since a federal court ruled her case is governed solely by state law, thereby precluding summary judgment based on ERISA preemption.[2] In points six and seven, plaintiff contends her claims against the Union and IBEW were not preempted by ERISA.

In this summary judgment case, the facts shown by plaintiff are taken as true. *See Nixon v. Mr. Property Management Co.*, 690 S.W.2d 546, 548-49 (Tex. 1985). The motion for summary judgment for all defendants except the Union states:

> Defendants are entitled to dismissal of Plaintiff's claims of wrongful discharge and breach of contract because they are preempted by the [ERISA].

---

[2] Plaintiff's case was remanded to state court by the federal court. The Order states that plaintiff's cause of action is based exclusively on the decision of *Sabine Pilot Service, Inc. v. Hauck*, 687 S.W.2d 733 (Tex. 1985). The court found that her cause of action did not arise under federal law. ERISA was not an issue in the motion to remove to federal court or in the response. Significantly, the court did not make any ruling based on ERISA.

It further states the *Sabine Pilot* wrongful discharge doctrine does not apply and that the required outrageous conduct required for a claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress is not involved as a matter of law. The Union's motion for summary judgment states it had no role in plaintiff's termination, which plaintiff conceded in her deposition. Further, the Union joins the other defendants' motion for summary judgment and relies on the ERISA preemption.

Plaintiff began employment in 1981 with the IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND Local 716 (the Fund), located in Houston. She later became the administrator of the Fund, holding that position until she was terminated on April 18, 1989. She was in charge of administration of the Fund as supervised by the defendant Trustees. One of plaintiff's duties was to administer loans to employees from the Fund. It is without dispute that the Fund is an employee benefit plan governed by ERISA and that loans may be made only according to the rules and regulations governing the Fund.

Plaintiff's petition alleged she discovered the Trustees were approving loans from the IBEW Trust Fund to employees she believed to be ineligible according to the Fund's rules and regulations. She refused to process these loans. Subsequently, plaintiff was discharged. She claimed the Union and Trustees acted in concert and conspired in approving the loans. She alleged that although economic and other "false" reasons were given, her discharge resulted because of her refusal to process the "illegal" loans. Deposition evidence reflects that hardship loans were made to employees who suffered economic losses in a nuclear project.

The "Relate To" Provision

Section 514(a) of ERISA provides:

> Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the provisions of this subchapter and subchapter III of this chapter shall supersede any and all state laws insofar as they now or hereafter relate to any employee benefit plan described in section 1003(a) of this title.

The Texas Supreme Court in *Gorman v. Life Ins. Co. of North America* held:

> Section 1132(a)(1)(B) and (e) of ERISA provide that state courts of competent jurisdiction and district courts of the United States have concurrent jurisdiction of actions by a beneficiary: 1) to recover benefits due under the terms of the plan; 2) to enforce rights under the plan; or 3) to clarify rights to future benefits. Any other civil ERISA action is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal courts. 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e)(1) (1988). Accordingly, when a state court suit alleged in terms of a state common-law or statutory cause of action "relates to" an employee welfare benefit plan, ERISA may preempt the state law in favor of federal law.

Gorman v. Life Ins. Co. of North America, 811 S.W.2d 542, 545 (Tex. 1991), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 824 (1991). The *Gorman* court further held the petitioner's state common-law claim for breach of fiduciary duty relates to an employee benefit plan governed by ERISA, and since it is not a claim for one of the three above noted actions, ERISA preempts that cause of action. *Id.* at 547. However, the court also noted that the breach of contract claim to recover benefits could be recharacterized as a claim for

benefits due under the plan. Therefore, the state court had concurrent jurisdiction, but the case was subject to removal under ERISA. *Id.* at 548.

A state law, defined in section 1144(c)(1) to include all laws, decisions, rules, regulations, or other action having the effect of law, is preempted by ERISA only if it "relates to" a plan. 29 U.S.C. § 1144(a) (1988); *Cathey v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 805 S.W.2d 387, 389 (Tex. 1991), *cert. denied*, 501 U.S. 1232 (1991). The question is whether a state law, as defined, relates to an employee benefit plan.

"A law 'relates to' an employee benefit plan, in the normal sense of the phrase, if it has a connection or reference to such a plan." *Cathey*, 805 S.W.2d at 389 (quoting *Shaw v. Delta Air Lines*, 463 U.S. 85, 96-97, 103 S. Ct. 2890, 77 L. Ed. 2d 490 (1983)); *see Pilot Life Ins. Co. v. Dedeaux*, 481 U.S. 41, 47, 107 S. Ct. 1549, 95 L. Ed. 2d 39 (1987) (common law cause of action – tort and contract – based on alleged improper processing of a benefit claim under employee benefit plan "relate to" an employee benefit plan and therefore fall under ERISA's preemption clause).

The *Cathey* court noted that the phrase "relate to" has been given a broad meaning and that "relate to" should be construed expansively.

> In keeping with this broad interpretation, the [United States Supreme] Court held that a cause of action for wrongful termination related to an ERISA plan where it was based on the allegation that the employer fired the employee to avoid paying benefits under a pension plan. *Ingersoll-*

Rand Co. v. McClendon, ___ U.S. ___, 111 S. Ct. 478, 112 L. Ed. 2d 474 (1990).

Cathey, 805 S.W.2d at 390. State laws having an effect on employee benefit plans relate to such plans. *Id.* Therefore, given the breadth of the preemption clause and the broad remedial purpose of ERISA, state laws found to be beyond the scope of the preemption provision are few. *Id.* (quoting *Cefalu v. B.F. Goodrich Co.*, 871 F.2d 1290, 1294 (5th Cir. 1989)).

The plaintiff in *Southland Life Ins. Co. v. Estate of Small*, 806 S.W.2d 800 (Tex. 1991), was dismissed by her employer six months after an accident, and the insurance company ceased payment of medical expenses after the dismissal. Plaintiff sued for breach of contract, breach of duty of good faith and fair dealing, fraud, negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and violations of the Texas Insurance Code, Deceptive Trade Practices Act, and ERISA. Citing *Gorman* and *Cathey*, the court held that the plaintiff's "claims are among those defined as relating to an employee benefit plan and are thus preempted by ERISA."[3] *Id.* at 801.

The question of law before the court in the present case is whether the causes under state laws as alleged by plaintiff relate to the employee benefit plan, IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716.

---

[3] It was not necessary for the trial court to make any determination as to "outrageous conduct" in connection with emotional distress since that cause of action was also preempted by ERISA.

To demonstrate that the acts of the Trustees and Fund were illegal, Plaintiff cites a possible violation of a state criminal statute, TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 32.45 (Vernon 1994) (misapplication of fiduciary property or property of financial institution). She contends the actual reason for her wrongful discharge was because she refused to perform illegal acts (processing loans). She relies on *Sabine Pilot Service, Inc. v. Hauck*, 687 S.W.2d 733 (Tex. 1985), which created this narrow exception to the employment-at-will doctrine. In *Sabine Pilot*, however, the illegality of the act which Hauck refused to perform as ordered was clearly established: posted signs on the boat proclaimed it was illegal to pump bilges into the water, and the U.S. Coastguard confirmed this constituted a specific federal law violation. Further, there was no ERISA plan issue.

In the present case, unlike *Sabine Pilot*, the illegality of the acts is one of belief or speculation by plaintiff, and there is an ERISA plan. These electrical union workers, according to plaintiff's belief, were allegedly ineligible for such hardship loans from their own Fund employee accounts. She indicates the Trustees committed a crime by authorizing the unemployment loans. There clearly must be an interpretation of the Fund plan to determine whether the act of distributing pension funds in the form of unemployment loans to Fund participants was, in fact, unauthorized according to the specific terms of the ERISA benefit plan.

A federal court of appeals held that a former plan fiduciary's *Sabine Pilot* claim that he was discharged for refusing to commit an illegal act is preempted by ERISA when the alleged illegalities relate to his duties and responsibilities under the plan. *Anderson v. Electronic Data*

Systems Corp., 11 F.3rd 1311, 1314 (5th Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, ___ U.S. ___, 115 S. Ct. 55, 130 L. Ed. 2d 14 1994). The court emphasized that Anderson's claim could not be resolved without construing the underlying ERISA plan. *Id.* at 1313-14. Further, the court noted the state law claim conflicted with the remedy provisions of ERISA. *Id.* at 1314.

Another case is instructive. The plaintiff in *Authier v. Ginsberg*, 757 F.2d 796 (6th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 888 (1985), was a former administrator of an employee welfare benefit plan governed by ERISA. Like the former administrator in the present case, Authier claimed wrongful discharge because he insisted on following legal requirements of the plan. Noting this involved regulation of an employee pension and welfare benefit plan, the court found the state law claims were preempted by ERISA. *Id.* at 802; *see also Hashimoto v. Bank of Hawaii*, 999 F.2d 408, 410 (9th Cir. 1993) (employee's claim of wrongful discharge and breach of employment contract as result of her complaint of alleged improprieties in administration of bank's profit-sharing, pension and severance plans preempted because related to ERISA plans which required interpretation).

Significantly, plaintiff acknowledged in her deposition that the eligibility of the employee/borrowers of hardship loans is "determined by the terms of the Plan itself . . . what standards they had to meet." The alleged illegalities relate to plaintiff's duties and responsibilities under the plan, as well as those of the Trustees. We find an interpretation of the benefit plan is required to determine whether the hardship loans were made in willful

disregard of the rules and regulations of the pension trust fund.

We hold that because the inquiry must necessarily be directed to the underlying ERISA plan and its rules and regulations, plaintiff's state causes of action against the IBEW Union, the named persons, both individually and as Trustees of the Fund, and the IBEW Trust Fund relate to the ERISA benefit plan and are preempted by ERISA. The summary judgment is proper. The points of error are overruled.

The judgment is affirmed.

SHIRLEY W. BUTTS
JUSTICE

DO NOT PUBLISH

APPENDIX B

THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS LETTER ORDER DENYING REVIEW

[SEAL]

THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS
Post Office Box 12248
Austin, Texas 78711 (512) 463-1312

October 18, 1996

Ms. Veda Ann Moore
Moore & Moore
14141 Southwest Freeway
Suite 1500
Sugar Land, TX 77478

Mr. Robert L. Ivey
Vinson & Elkins
2300 First City Tower
1001 Fannin Street
Houston, TX 77002-6760

Mr. Patrick M. Flynn
1235 North Loop W.,
Suite 1235
Houston, TX 77008

Mr. Thomas W. Moore
Moore & Moore
One Sugar Creek Place
14141 Southwest Freeway
Ste. 1500
Sugarland, TX 77478-3435

Mr. Stuart B. Johnston
1001 Fannin, Suite 2902
Houston, TX 77002-6760

RE: Case Number 96-0398
Style: LEAMINDA COKER
v.
JAMES P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, RAY WILLIAMS, GEORGE E. SUMROW, CLIFFORD HENDERSON, CHARLES MELTON, individually and as trustees of the IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, et al.

Dear Counsel:

Today, the Supreme Court of Texas denied the above referenced application for writ of error, as amended, with the notation "Writ Denied".

Sincerely,

John T. Adams, Clerk

by /s/ Michael C. Murphey
Michael C. Murphey, Deputy

APPENDIX C

ORDER
DISTRICT COURT OF
HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS
164TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

No. 90-16254

LEAMINDA COKER	§	IN THE DISTRICT
VS.	§	COURT OF
	§	
JAMES P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, RAY WILLIAMS,	§	
GEORGE E. SUMROW,	§	HARRIS COUNTY,
CLIFFORD HENDERSON,	§	TEXAS
CHARLES MELTON,	§	
Individually and as Trustees of the IBEW Pension Trust	§	
Fund Local 716, IBEW	§	164TH JUDICIAL
PENSION TRUST FUND	§	DISTRICT
LOCAL 716, and	§	
INTERNATIONAL	§	
BROTHERHOOD OF	§	
ELECTRICAL WORKERS,	§	
LOCAL UNION 716	§	
	§	

ORDER

The Court has heard the motion for summary judgment filed in this cause by Defendants James P. Douglas, A. A. Cook, Ray Williams, George E. Sumrow, Clifford Henderson, Charles Melton and the IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716 (collectively the Defendants). All parties appeared by and through their respective counsel. The court, after examining the pleadings and the summary judgment evidence and hearing the arguments of counsel, determines that the Defendants are entitled to summary judgment as follows

a. The defendants motion for summary judgment on plaintiff's claim of intentional infliction of emotional

distress is GRANTED. The defendants conduct, which plaintiff alleges constituted the intentional infliction of emotional distress, was not "outrageous conduct" as a matter of law.

b. The defendant's motion for summary judgment on plaintiff's claims of breach of contract and wrongful discharge is GRANTED because these issues are preempted by the federal Employment Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA). The Texas breach of contract and wrongful discharge laws are preempted because the IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716 is an ERISA regulated pension plan, plaintiff is a covered recipient of the IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716 benefits, the Texas breach of contract and wrongful discharge laws "relate to," i.e. have a connection with or a reference the Pension Trust Fund Local 716, and the Pension Trust Fund Local 716 is a critical factor in establishing liability under Texas's wrongful discharge law.

c. The defendant's motion for summary judgment as to plaintiff's claim of civil conspiracy is likewise preempted because it is based on plaintiff's claims of breach of contract and wrongful discharge, which were preempted in paragraph b., above.

It is therefore ORDERED that defendants's [sic] motion for summary judgment is GRANTED. All relief not expressly granted herein is denied.

SIGNED April 29, 1994.

/s/ Katie Kennedy
Judge Katie Kennedy
Judge Presiding

APPENDIX D

FINAL JUDGMENT
DISTRICT COURT OF
HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS
164TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

No. 90-16254

LEAMINDA COKER Plaintiff, JAMES P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, RAY WILLIAMS, GEORGE E. SUMROW, CLIFFORD HENDERSON, CHARLES MELTON, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS TRUSTEES OF THE IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, AND INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 716 Defendants.	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS 164TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

FINAL JUDGMENT

The Court granted summary judgment in favor of all defendants as to plaintiff's claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress because no conduct of any defendant was outrageous as a matter of law. The Court granted summary judgment in favor of all defendants as to all other claims by plaintiff because those claims are pre-empted by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974. Accordingly, final judgment in favor of all defendants is appropriate. It is, therefore,

ORDERED that Plaintiff Leaminda Coker take nothing by this suit and that Defendants James P. Douglas, A.

A. Cook, Ray Williams, George Sumrow, Clifford Henderson, and Charles Melton, individually and as Trustees, and IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716, and IBEW Local Union 716, be in all things discharged and go hence without day. All costs of Court are taxed against Plaintiff, for which let execution issue.

All other relief not expressly granted in this judgment is denied.

Signed this 31 day of October 1994.

/s/ Katie Kennedy
JUDGE PRESIDING

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

/s/ Carrie Weitinger
CARRIE WEITINGER SBN 21115600

WEITINGER & WEITINGER

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT IBEW

/s/ Illegible Flynn

/s/ Illegible
ATTORNEY FOR IBEW TRUST FUND AND DEFENDANTS JAMES P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, RAY WILLIAMS, GEORGE E. SUMROW, CLIFFORD HENDERSON CHARLES MELTON, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS TRUSTEES OF THE IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, AND INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 716

APPENDIX E

COURT OF APPEALS
LETTER DENYING REHEARING

COURT OF APPEALS
FOURTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT
300 DOLOROSA, SUITE 3200
BEXAR COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78205
HERB SCHAEFER, CLERK

April 2, 1996

Veda Moore
MOORE AND MOORE, P.C.
14141 Southwest Freeway,
Suite 1500
Sugarland, TX 77478

Thomas W. Moore
MOORE AND MOORE, P.C.
14141 Southwest Freeway,
Suite 1500
Sugarland, TX 77478

Patrick M. Flynn
1235 North Loop W,
Suite 1235
Houston, TX 77008

Stuart B. Johnston, Jr.
VINSON & ELKINS, L.L.P.
1001 Fannin, Suite 2902
Houston, TX 77002-6760

Robert L. Ivey
VINSON & ELKINS, L.L.P.
1001 Fannin, Suite 2902
Houston, TX 77002-6760

RE: Court of Appeals Number: 04-95-00204-CV
Trial Court Case Number: 90-016254

Style: Leaminda Coker
v.
James P. Douglas; A.A. Cook; Ray Williams; George E. Sumrow; Clifford Henderson; Charles Melton, Individually and as Trustees of the IBEW Pension Trust Local 716; Et Al.

Dear Counsel:

The Appellant's Motion for Rehearing in the above styled and numbered cause has this date been DENIED.

Very truly yours,

HERB SCHAEFER, CLERK

/s/ Elise Dixon
Elise Dixon, Deputy Clerk

APPENDIX F

EXCERPTS FROM COKER'S MOTION FOR REHEARING IN THE STATE COURT OF APPEALS

EXCERPTS FROM COKER'S MOTION FOR REHEARING IN THE STATE COURT OF APPEALS

CAUSE NO. 04-9500204-CV
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOURTH SUPREME JUDICIAL DISTRICT
OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

LEAMINDA COKER, *PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT,* v. JAMES P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, RAY WILLIAMS, GEORGE E. SUMROW, CLIFFORD HENDERSON, CHARLES MELTON, Individually and as Trustees of the IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, and IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, and the INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 716, *DEFENDANTS/APPELLEES.*	)( )( )( )( )( )( )( )( )( )( )( )( )( )( )( )(	* * *

On Appeal From the 164th Judicial District Court
Harris County, Texas

APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR REHEARING

VEDA MOORE
THOMAS W. MOORE
Moore and Moore, P.C.
14141 Southwest Freeway
Suite 1500
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
(713) 242-8004
(713) 242-82224-Telecopier
ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT,
LEAMINDA COKER

* * *

STATEMENT OF POINTS OF ERROR

* * *

POINT OF ERROR THREE

The Court of appeals erred in overruling Points of Error 5, 6 and 7 on the grounds that the state laws upon which plaintiff relies in support of her claims "relate to" an employee benefit plan governed by ERISA and are therefore are [sic] preempted.

POINT OF ERROR FOUR

The Court of appeals erred in affirming a summary judgment based on ERISA preemption where the effect of the judgment violates the "open courts" provision of the Texas Constitution and the "due process" guarantees of both the Texas Constitution and the United States Constitution.

* * *

3. CONTENTIONS RELATING TO POINT OF ERROR NUMBER THREE

POINT OF ERROR NO. 3: **The Court of appeals erred in overruling Points of Error 5, 6 and 7 on the grounds that the state laws upon which plaintiff relies in support of her claims "relate to" an employee benefit plan governed by ERISA and are therefore preempted.**

The authorities cited in this Court's opinion in support of its affirmance of the trial court's finding of ERISA preemption can be distinguished from plaintiff's case in that in each case the plaintiff was seeking a benefit under an ERISA plan. In *Ingersoll-Rand Co. v. McClendon*, ___ U.S., 111 S. Ct. 478, 112 L. Ed. 2d 474 (1990), the "state law" relied upon by the plaintiff "depended upon" the existence of a benefit plan in the context that the plaintiff was seeking to enforce rights as a beneficiary under a plan to obtain benefits under the plan. In that case the Supreme Court of the United States placed a great deal of emphasis upon the fact that ERISA contained an exclusive enforcement mechanism where an employee is fired in order to keep him from vesting in a pension plan, i.e.,

to keep him from receiving benefits under a plan. In deciding whether plaintiff's claim of wrongful discharge "relates to" an ERISA plan, this Court is required to focus on the employer's motivation in the firing and only if the employer's conduct which gives rise to the wrongful discharge claim is also integral to a claim for benefits under the plan does ERISA preempt the wrongful discharge. Texas [statutory] law prohibiting termination of an employee to keep him from vesting in a pension plan is virtually identical to the ERISA provision covering the same subject matter as the Texas law relied upon by the plaintiff in *Ingersoll-Rand*. Moreover, the conduct of the employer, attempting to avoid paying plaintiff benefits under the plan, is the subject of the Texas statute involved in *Ingersoll-Rand*. Moreover, the facts relating to the employer's conduct and motivation in the termination are integral to the employee's claim for benefits under the plan in that case.

* * *

The plaintiff seeks no benefit under the Plan and does not seek any right [as a beneficiary] under the Plan or any relief that would affect the Plan.

* * *

The law is clear that an ERISA plan can be sued in tort just as any other party and such claims are not preempted just by virtue of the fact that the defendant is an ERISA plan. See *General American Life Ins. Co. vs. Castonguay*, 984 F.2d 1518 (9th Cir. 1993).

* * *

Plaintiff was not a "fiduciary" under the plan in this case.

* * *

The issue involves only the employer-employee relationship between IBEW and plaintiff and whether IBEW's discharge of plaintiff *for those reasons,* was wrongful under Texas law. The Federal Court determined as much in its Order remanded this case to the State District Court on the grounds that plaintiff's causes of action were founded solely under State law and no federal jurisdiction existed. The question of jurisdiction of state courts in actions involving 29 U.S.C. 1132 [ERISA] must be determined solely by reference to allegations in a plaintiff's complaint, not on the basis of issues raised in a defendant's answer. Therefore, the federal court's findings of no removal jurisdiction were based on the same criteria the federal court would consider in determining whether ERISA preempted plaintiff's wrongful discharge and other claims. The result would be that no federal jurisdiction existed under ERISA based on the allegations in plaintiff's pleadings.

* * *

The trustees were responsible for employment decisions relating to plaintiff and had the authority to fire plaintiff only for just cause, as stated in plaintiff's written contract of employment. The issue therefore with respect to that cause of action was whether the trustees had "just cause" to fire plaintiff. The common law of breach of contract in this case obviously does not "relate to" a plan in the context of ERISA preemption.

This Court's reliance on *Anderson v. Electronic Data Systems, Corp.*, 11 F. 3d 1311, 1314 (5th Cir. 1994), cert. denied, ___ U.S. ___, 115 S. Ct. 55, 130 L. Ed. 2d 14 (1994)

and *Authier v. Ginsberg*, 757 F.2d 796 (6th Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 888 (1985), is misplaced. Plaintiff in this case was not the Administrator charged with administering the ERISA plan as was the plaintiff in *Anderson*. Defendants conceded at oral argument that plaintiff could only act with approval of the trustees. The trustees were the named "Administrator" of the plan within the meaning of ERISA. Plaintiff was not an "Administrator" within the purview of ERISA. Plaintiff had no authority to carry out any plan provision without prior trustee instruction and approval. This case does not involve plaintiff's conduct as the fiduciary charged with administering the plan. The point is significant because ERISA regulates plan fiduciaries such as the Administrator of the plan.

* * *

4. CONTENTIONS RELATING TO POINT OF ERROR NUMBER FOUR.

POINT OF ERROR NO. 4: **The Court of appeals erred in affirming a summary judgment based on ERISA preemption where the effect of the judgment violates the "open courts" provision of the Texas Constitution and the "due process" guarantees of both the Texas Constitution and the United States Constitution.**

The trial court's summary judgment in favor of defendants on the grounds of ERISA preemption, affirmed by this Court's opinion, leaves plaintiff without a remedy. Significantly, *plaintiff has no cause of action under ERISA*. The trial court impermissibly expanded the scope

of ERISA to apply to claims which relate only to plaintiff's termination of employment and not to the denial of benefits. A claim does not relate to a plan even though the employer's conduct occurred contemporaneously with an alleged ERISA violation, unless the facts relevant to the state law claims relate to the employee's failure to receive benefits. Plaintiff has not asserted any claim for benefits under an ERISA plan in this case. As found in the Federal District Court's Order remanding plaintiff's case to State District Court, plaintiff's case arises solely under the wrongful discharge laws of Texas.

* * *

The Texas wrongful discharge law involved in this case in no way purports to regulate an ERISA plan in this case. ERISA contains no provision or remedy to redress the wrongs claimed by plaintiff in this case. Any remedy afforded plaintiff under her common law causes of action asserted in this case would not impact upon the law of ERISA or require application of any provision of ERISA. Plaintiff asserts cognizable common-law causes of action which are being restricted by the trial court's unauthorized expansion of ERISA preemption and that restriction, balanced against the purpose of ERISA, is unreasonable and arbitrary. It was error for this Court to affirm the trial court's summary judgment based upon a finding of ERISA preemption where such judgment has the effect of infringing plaintiff's constitutional guarantee of access to the courts of this state to redress wrongs against her.

Plaintiff is thus denied her day in court and is denied the *due course of law* guarantee of both the state and

federal Constitutions. The right to a day in court and the privilege of being heard before judgment is the essence of due process of law and that privilege has been taken away from plaintiff.

Article 1, Section 13 of the Texas Constitution provides that "[all courts shall be open, and every person for an injury done to him in his lands, goods, person or reputation, shall have a remedy by due course of law." This provision, and Section 19 of the Texas Constitution, as well as U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 14, guarantees every person the right of due process of law. The trial court's summary judgment, affirmed by this Court, violates plaintiff's constitutional rights.

* * *

APPENDIX G

EXCERPTS FROM COKER'S SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION FOR REHEARING IN THE STATE COURT OF APPEALS

EXCERPTS FROM COKER'S SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION FOR REHEARING IN THE STATE COURT OF APPEALS

CAUSE NO. 04-9500204-CV
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOURTH SUPREME JUDICIAL DISTRICT
OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

LEAMINDA COKER,	)(
PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT,	)(
	)(
v.	)(
JAMES P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, RAY WILLIAMS, GEORGE E. SUMROW, CLIFFORD HENDERSON, CHARLES MELTON, Individually and as Trustees of the IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, and IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, and the INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 716,	)(
	)(
DEFENDANTS/APPELLEES.	)(

SUPPLEMENT TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR REHEARING

TO THE COURT OF APPEALS:

Appellant, Leaminda Coker, files this Supplement to her Motion for Rehearing filed under the authority of Tex. R. App. P. 100(a) and requests this Court consider

this Supplement, and attachment, in considering the merits of Appellant's Motion for Rehearing.

SUPPLEMENT TO CONTENTIONS RELATING TO POINT OF ERROR NUMBER THREE

POINT OF ERROR NO. 3: **The Court of appeals erred in overruling Points of Error 5, 6 and 7 on the grounds that the state laws upon which plaintiff relies in support of her claims "relate to" an employee benefit plan governed by ERISA are therefore are preempted.**

Attached to this Supplement is a copy of the transcript from the oral argument before the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Ingersoll-Rand Co. v. McClendon*, ___ U.S., 111 S. Ct. 478, 112 L. Ed. 2d 474 (1990). Appellant has consistently argued before the trial court and before this Honorable Court that the wrongful discharge cause of action plead by plaintiff in the case at bar does not "relate to" an ERISA plan. Appellant does not seek to enforce any rights under an ERISA plan, nor does Appellant state any claim for benefits under an ERISA plan. Appellant in fact has no cause of action under ERISA.

The questions and comments of the Supreme Court Justices in the attached transcript, as well as the answers to those questions, make clear that in order for ERISA to preempt a wrongful discharge claim, the employee must prove that the purpose of her discharge was to deprive her of benefits under the plan or where the employer's termination of the employee "interferes with plan benefits." See p. 7 of attached transcript, and other highlighted sections of the transcript.

Also, the Court's comments on p. 15 demonstrate that the [ERISA] statute does not require that the cause of action "relate to the terms or conditions of an ERISA plan." This Court has reasoned that Coker's cause of action "relates to" an ERISA plan because the Plan will have to be interpreted. The central issue of ERISA pre-emption in the context of a wrongful discharge case in Texas, is the employer's motivation and that motivation *must be a pension defeating motive.* This is stated specifically by the Supreme Court in the *Ingersoll-Rand* case at p. 483. The Court holds: ***"Thus, in order to prevail, a plaintiff must plead, and the court must find, that an ERISA plan exists and the employer had a pension-defeating motive in terminating the employment."*** [emphasis supplied]. Appellant's case DOES NOT meet this criteria and her wrongful discharge case, as plead, does not make any allegations that her employer's motive in terminating her was in any way "pension defeating."

Appellant's wrongful discharge claim arises solely under the Texas public policy common law exception to the employee at will doctrine.

* * *

APPENDIX H

EXCERPTS FROM COKER'S APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF ERROR IN THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT

NO. 96-0398

IN THE

SUPREME COURT

OF TEXAS

LEAMINDA COKER,

Petitioner,

VS.

JAMES P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, RAY WILLIAMS, GEORGE E. SUMROW, CLIFFORD HENDERSON, CHARLES MELTON, Individually and as Trustees of the IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, and IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, and the INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 716,

Respondents.

Appealed From the Fourth Court of Appeals
Bexar County, Texas; Cause No. 04-9500204-CV

APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF ERROR
[Corrected]

VEDA MOORE
SBT No. 14378600
MOORE AND MOORE, P.C.
14141 Southwest Freeway, #1500
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
(713) 242-8004
(713) 242-8224-Telecopier
Attorney for Appellant,
Leaminda Coker

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

* * *

POINT OF ERROR THREE
(Restated)

The Court of appeals erred in overruling Points of Error 5, 6 and 7 on the grounds that the state laws upon which plaintiff relies in support of her claims "relate to" an employee benefit plan governed by ERISA and are therefore preempted.

ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES FOR POINT OF ERROR THREE

Respondents, as defendant-movants, were required to establish their defense of ERISA preemption as a matter of law. *Citizens First Nat. Bank Etc. v. Cinco Explor.*, 540 S.W.2d 292, 294 (Tex. 1976); *Munoz v. Gulf Oil Co.*, 693 S.W.2d 372, 373 (Tex. 1984).

In raising the defense that petitioner's case is preempted by that Act, respondents were required to show that petitioner's claims fell within the statute as a matter of law. *Hernandez v. Lukefahr*, 879 S.W.2d 137, 140 (Tex.App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 1994, no writ).

Coker's claim does not fall within the scope of civil actions available under the Act and the Act's preemption clause therefore does not apply. As demonstrated above, respondents wholly failed to establish that Coker was either an ERISA administrator or fiduciary. It is undisputed that Coker did not assert any claims as a beneficiary/participant of an ERISA plan. Coker did not seek recovery of any benefits under the plan nor did Coker

seek to enforce any substantive provision of the plan. Therefore, the court's disposition of Coker's claims would have absolutely no effect on the body of law regulating ERISA plans.

There are different types of civil actions available under 29 U.S.C. Sec. 1132 [ERISA]. It should be noted that the actions listed are available only to a "beneficairy" or "participant" or an [ERISA] "fiduciary" who asserts the type of claims described. Section 502 of the Act provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

> (a) A civil action may be brought –
>
> (1) by a ***participant or beneficiary*** –
>
> (B) ***to recover benefits*** due to him under the terms of the plan, ***to enforce his rights*** under the terms of the plan, or ***clarify his rights to future benefits*** under the terms of the plan;
>
> (2) by a participant, beneficiary, **or fiduciary** (a) to enjoin an act or practice which violates any provision of this subchapter or the terms of the plan, or (b) to obtain other appropriate equitable relief (i) to redress such violations or (ii) to enforce any provision of this subchapter or the terms of the plan.

[emphasis supplied]. It is not disputed that Coker did not bring any claim in the capacity of either a participant, beneficiary or fiduciary for any of the relief described above. Moreover, respondents did not establish that Coker was an ERISA fiduciary as a matter of law. See *Donovan v. Mercer*, 747 F.2d 304 (5th Cir. 1984), ("fiduciary" should be defined not only by reference to particular

titles . . . but also by considering the authority which a particular person has or exercises over an employee benefit plan). As stated in the written Trust, as a mere assistant to the trustees, Coker did not have any discretionary authority with respect to the Plan.

Paragraph (21)(a) of Section 1002 of ERISA defines "fiduciary" for purposes of the Act as follows:

(21)(a) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph

> (B), a person is a fiduciary with respect to a plan to the extent (i) he exercises any **discretionary authority or control respecting management or disposition of its assets,** (ii) he renders investment advice for a fee or other compensation, direct or indirect, with respect to any moneys or other property of such plan, or has any authority or responsibility to do so, or (iii) he has any discretionary authority or discretionary responsibility in the administration of such plan. Such term includes any person designated under section 1105(c)(1)(B) of this title. [emphasis supplied].

In addition, Respondents failed to establish that Coker was an ERISA administrator as a matter of law. Coker was given the job title of "Administrator" by the trustees, but the trust instrument imposes all responsibility and duties with respect to the assets of the ERISA Plan upon the trustees alone. (Appendix 2).

29 U.S.C. Sec. 1002(16)(A) defines an "administrator" for purposes of the statute [ERISA]:

> (16)(a) The term "administrator" means –
>
> (i) the person ***specifically so designated by the terms of the instrument under which the plan is operated;***
>
> (ii) if an administrator is not so designated, the plan sponsor; or
>
> (iii) in the case of a plan for which an administrator is not designated and a plan sponsor cannot be identified, such other person as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe.

[emphasis supplied]. Respondents did not establish as a matter of law that Coker meets any of the above criteria. Respondents cannot avoid their burden to establish that Coker was an ERISA administrator simply because she was given the title "Administrator" by her Employer. Unless respondents establish that Coker was an ERISA "fiduciary" or "administrator" as a matter of law, and/or that she seeks relief in her suit as a beneficiary/participant of an ERISA plan, Coker's suit is not subject to a claim that ERISA's preemption section applies.

29 U.S.C. Sec. 1140 [ERISA] specifically prohibits, among other things, the discharge of an employee for the purpose of interfering with the attainment of any right to which the employee, as a plan participant, may become entitled under the plan. This section triggered ERISA preemption in *Ingersoll Rand, supra.* Preemption in the case was unavoidable because the United States Supreme Court found that the employee's claim was really a

"claim for benefits." Preemption of state law claims by ERISA depends on the conduct to which such law is applied, not on the form or label of the law. *Morishige v. Spencecliff Corporation*, 720 F. Supp. 829, 838 (D. Hawaii, August 4, 1989). A state law claim does not "relate to" an employee benefit plan and is not preempted by ERISA *unless* facts relating to the employee's failure to receive benefits are relevant to the state law claim. *Farlow v. Union Cent. Life Ins. Co.*, 874 F.2d 791 (11th Cir. 1989). In *Farlow*, the court held that a claim did not relate to a plan even though the employer's conduct occurred contemporaneously with an alleged ERISA violation, *unless* the facts relating to the employee's failure to receive benefits *are relevant to the state law claim. Id.* at 794.

In *Ingersoll-Rand*, the motivation of the employer in firing the plaintiff was to avoid paying pension benefits. *Ingersoll-Rand* requires that the employer's motivation be "pension defeating." It is undisputed that there is no pension defeating motive involved in this case. Coker filed a supplement to her Motion for Rehearing in the court of appeals, providing that court with a copy of the transcript of oral argument in the *Ingersoll-Rand* case. The focus of the Court at oral argument on the employer's motivation [for the termination] supports Coker's contentions that ERISA does not preempt her claims because she is not seeking to recover any benefits or enforce any rights under an ERISA plan. The fact that Coker's case concerns only an employer/employee relationship and not a beneficiary/participant/fiduciary relationship, is also key.

* * *

Coker does not need to prove that she is entitled to her job under the terms of the plan or that the trustees engaged in misconduct with respect to their fiduciary positions under the plan. Coker need only prove that she was fired because she refused to participate in conduct which exposed her to criminal prosecution. As argued above, preemption of state laws by ERISA depends on the conduct to which the law is applied. *Morishige,* supra.

* * *

POINT OF ERROR FOUR
(Restated)

The Court of appeals erred in affirming a summary judgment based on ERISA preemption where the effect of the judgment violates the "open courts" provision of the Texas Constitution and the "due process" guarantees of both the Texas Constitution and the United States Constitution.

As argued under Point of Error Three above, petitioner's claim does not come within any of the criteria of 29 U.S.C. Sec. 502 [ERISA]. The trial court's summary judgment in favor of respondents on the grounds of ERISA preemption leaves petitioner without a forum to address her claim. The trial court erroneously applied ERISA's preemption clause in a vacuum and found preemption of claims which are not within the scope of the Act as set forth in Section 502. *Farlow, supra.*

As a matter of law, a claim does not relate to a plan even though the employer's conduct occurred contemporaneously with an alleged ERISA violation, unless the facts relevant to the state law claims relate to the

employee's failure to receive benefits. Petitioner has not asserted any claim for benefits under an ERISA plan in this case.

A federal judge has ruled that Coker's case arises solely under the wrongful discharge laws of Texas and does not present a federal question. (See Appendix 3). The Texas wrongful discharge law involved in this case in no way purports to regulate an ERISA plan. ERISA contains no provision or remedy to redress the wrongs claimed by petitioner in this case.

Any remedy afforded Coker under her common law causes of action asserted in this case would not impact upon the law of ERISA or require application of any provision of ERISA. Coker asserts cognizable common-law causes of action which are being restricted by the trial court's erroneous expansion of ERISA preemption and that restriction, balanced against the purpose of ERISA, is unreasonable and arbitrary.

It was error for the court of appeals to affirm the trial court's summary judgment based upon a finding of ERISA preemption where such judgment has the effect of infringing petitioner's constitutional guarantee of access to the courts of this state to redress wrongs against her.

Petitioner is thus denied her day in court and is denied the *due course of law* guarantee of both the state and federal Constitutions. The right to a day in court and the privilege of being heard before judgment is the essence of due process of law and that privilege has been taken away from Coker. The trial court and the court of appeals dismiss the findings in the federal judge's Remand Order. The court of appeals fails to accord any

consideration to such Order based upon an erroneous conclusion that the ERISA argument was not before the federal court when the Remand Order was entered. See argument under the STATEMENT section above. Coker's claims did not hold her case in federal court and now the state court refuses to hear her claims.

Article 1, Section 13 of the Texas Constitution provides that "[a]ll courts shall be open, and every person for an injury done to him in his lands, goods, person or reputation, shall have a remedy by due course of law." This provision, and Section 19 of the Texas Constitution, as well as U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 14, guarantees every person the right of due process of law. The trial court's summary judgment, affirmed by the court of appeals, violates plaintiff's constitutional rights.

* * *

APPENDIX I

AMENDMENT XIV TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment XIV.

The Fourteenth Amendment was ratified July 9, 1868.

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer

of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

APPENDIX J

29 U.S.C. § 1132 [ERISA]

29 U.S.C. § 1132 Civil enforcement

(a) Persons empowered to bring a civil action

A civil action may be brought –

(1) by a participant or beneficiary –

(A) for the relief provided for in subsection (c) of this section, or

(B) to recover benefits due to him under the terms of his plan, to enforce his rights under the terms of the plan, or to clarify his rights to future benefits under the terms of the plan;

(2) by the Secretary, or by a participant, beneficiary or fiduciary for appropriate relief under section 1109 of this title;

(3) by a participant, beneficiary, or fiduciary (A) to enjoin any act or practice which violates any provision of this subchapter or the terms of the plan; or (B) to obtain other appropriate equitable relief (i) to redress such violations or (ii) to enforce any provisions of this subchapter or the terms of the plan;

(4) by the Secretary, or by a participant, or beneficiary for appropriate relief in the case of a violation of 1025(c) of this title;

(5) except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, by the Secretary (A) to enjoin any act or practice which violates any provision of this subchapter, or (B) to obtain other appropriate equitable relief (i) to redress such violation or (ii) to enforce any provision of this subchapter;

(6) by the Secretary to collect any civil penalty under subsection (c)(2) or (i) or (*l*);

(7) by a State to enforce compliance with a qualified medical child support order (as defined in section 609(a)(2)(A) [29 U.S.C. 1169(a)(2)(A)]);

(8) by the Secretary, or by an employer or other person referred to in section 101(f)(1) [29 U.S.C. 1021(f)(1)], (A) to enjoin any act or practice which violates subsection (f) of section 101 [29 U.S.C. 1021(f)], or (B) to obtain appropriate equitable relief (i) to redress such violation or (ii) to enforce such subsection; or

(9) in the event that the purchase of an insurance contract or insurance annuity in connection with termination of an individual's status as a participant covered under a pension plan with respect to all or any portion of the participant's pension benefit under such plan constitutes a violation of part 4 of this title [29 U.S.C. 1101-1114] or the terms of the plan, by the Secretary, by any individual who was a participant or beneficiary at the time of the alleged violation, or by a fiduciary, to obtain appropriate relief, including the posting of security if necessary, to assure receipt by the participant or beneficiary of the amounts provided or to be provided by such insurance contract or annuity, plus reasonable prejudgment interest on such amounts.

(b) Plans qualified under Internal Revenue Code; maintenance of actions involving delinquent contributions

(1) In the case of a plan which is qualified under section 401(a), 403(a), or 405(a) of title 26 (or with respect to which an application to so qualify has been filed and has not been finally

determined) the Secretary may exercise his authority under subsection (a)(5) of this section with respect to a violation of, or the enforcement of, parts 2 and 3 of this subtitle (relating to participation, vesting, and funding), only if –

(A) requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, or

(B) one or more participants, beneficiaries, or fiduciaries, of such plan request in writing (in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation) that he exercise such authority on their behalf. In the case of such a request under this paragraph he may exercise such authority only if he determines that such violation affects, or such enforcement is necessary to protect, claims of participants or beneficiaries to benefits under the plan.

(2) The Secretary shall not initiate an action to enforce section 1145 of this title.

(c) Administrator's refusal to supply requested information; penalty for failure to provide annual report in complete form

(1) Any administrator (A) who fails to meet the requirements of paragraph (1) or (4) of section 1166 of this title or section 1021(e)(1) of this title with respect to a participant or beneficiary, or (B) who fails or refuses to comply with a request for any information which such administrator is required by this subchapter to furnish to a participant or beneficiary (unless such failure or refusal results from matters reasonably beyond the control of the administrator) by mailing the material requested to the last known address of the requesting participant or

beneficiary within 30 days after such request may in the court's discretion be personally liable to such participant or beneficiary in the amount of up to $100 a day from the date of such failure or refusal, and the court may in its discretion order such other relief as it deems proper.

(2) The Secretary may assess a civil penalty against any plan administrator of up to $1,000 a day from the date of such plan administrator's failure or refusal to file the annual report required to be filed with the Secretary under section 1021(b)(4) of this title. For purposes of this paragraph, an annual report that has been rejected under section 1024(a)(4) of this title for failure to provide material information shall not be treated as having been filed with the Secretary.

(3) Any employer maintaining a plan who fails to meet the notice requirement of section 1021(d) of this title with respect to any participant or beneficiary or who fails to meet the requirements of section 1021(c)(2) of this title with respect to any person may in the court's discretion be liable to such participant or beneficiary or to such person in the amount of up to $100 a day from the date of such failure, and the court may in its discretion order such other relief as it deems proper.

(4) The Secretary may assess a civil penalty of not more than $1,000 for each violation by any person of section 101(f)(1) [29 U.S.C. 1021(f)(1)]. For purposes of this paragraph, each violation described in subparagraph (A) with respect to any single participant, and each violation described in subparagraph (B) with respect to any single participant or beneficiary, shall be

treated as a separate violation. The Secretary and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall maintain such ongoing consultation as may be necessary and appropriate to coordinate enforcement under this subsection with enforcement under section 1144(c)(8) of the Social Security Act [42 U.S.C. 1320b-14(c)(8)].

(d) Status of employee benefit plan as entity

(1) An employee benefit plan may sue or be sued under this subchapter as an entity. Service of summons, subpena, or other legal process of a court upon a trustee or an administrator of an employee benefit plan in his capacity as such shall constitute service upon the employee benefit plan. In a case where a plan has not designated in the summary plan description of the plan an individual as agent for the service of legal process, service upon the Secretary shall constitute such service. The Secretary, not later than 15 days after receipt of service under the preceding sentence shall notify the administrator or any trustee of the plan of receipt of such service.

(2) Any money judgment under this subchapter against an employee benefit plan shall be enforceable only against the plan as an entity and shall not be enforceable against any other person unless liability against such person is established in his individual capacity under this subchapter.

(e) Jurisdiction

(1) Except for actions under subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section, the district courts of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions under this subchapter brought by

the Secretary or by a participant, beneficiary, fiduciary, or any person referred to in section 101(f)(1). State courts of competent jurisdiction and district courts of the United States shall have concurrent jurisdiction of actions under paragraphs (1)(B) and (7) of subsection (a) of this section.

(2) Where an action under this subchapter is brought in a district court of the United States, it may be brought in the district where the plan is administered, where the breach took place, or where a defendant resides or may be found, and process may be served in any other district where a defendant resides or may be found.

(f) Amount in controversy; citizenship of parties

The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without respect to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties, to grant the relief provided for in subsection (a) of this section in any action.

(g) Attorney's fees and costs; awards in actions involving delinquent contributions

(1) In any action under this subchapter (other than an action described in paragraph (2)) by a participant, beneficiary, or fiduciary, the court in its discretion may allow a reasonable attorney's fee and costs of action to either party.

(2) In any action under this subchapter by a fiduciary for or on behalf of a plan to enforce section 1145 of this title in which a judgment in favor of the plan is awarded, the court shall award the plan –

(A) the unpaid contributions,

(B) interest on the unpaid contributions,

(C) an amount equal to the greater of –

(i) interest on the unpaid contributions, or

(ii) liquidated damages provided for under the plan in an amount not in excess of 20 percent (or such higher percentage as may be permitted under Federal or State law) of the amount determined by the court under subparagraph (A),

(D) reasonable attorney's fees and costs of the action, to be paid by the defendant, and

(E) such other legal or equitable relief as the court deems appropriate. For purposes of this paragraph, interest on unpaid contributions shall be determined by using the rate provided under the plan, or, if none, the rate prescribed under section 6621 of title 26.

(h) Service upon Secretary of Labor and Secretary of the Treasury

A copy of the complaint in any action under this subchapter by a participant, beneficiary, or fiduciary (other than an action brought by one or more participants or beneficiaries under subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section which is solely for the purpose of recovering benefits due such participants under the terms of the plan) shall be

served upon the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury by certified mail. Either Secretary shall have the right in his discretion to intervene in any action, except that the Secretary of the Treasury may not intervene in any action under part 4 of this subtitle. If the Secretary brings an action under subsection (a) of this section on behalf of a participant or beneficiary, he shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury.

(i) Administrative assessment of civil penalty

In the case of a transaction prohibited by section 1106 of this title by a party in interest with respect to a plan to which this part applies, the Secretary may assess a civil penalty against such party in interest. The amount of such penalty may not exceed five percent of the amount involved in each such transaction (as defined in section 4975(f)(4) of title 26) for each year or part thereof during which the prohibited transaction continues, except that, if the transaction is not corrected (in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe in regulations which shall be consistent with section 4975(f)(5) of title 26) within 90 days after notice from the Secretary (or such longer period as the Secretary may permit), such penalty may be in an amount not more than 100 percent of the amount involved. This subsection shall not apply to a transaction with respect to a plan described in section 4975(e)(1) of title 26.

(j) Direction and control of litigation by Attorney General

In all civil actions under this subchapter, attorneys appointed by the Secretary may represent the Secretary (except as provided in section 518(a) of title 28), but all

such litigation shall be subject to the direction and control of the Attorney General.

(k) Jurisdiction of actions against the Secretary of Labor

Suits by an administrator, fiduciary, participant, or beneficiary of an employee benefit plan to review a final order of the Secretary, to restrain the Secretary from taking any action contrary to the provisions of this chapter, or to compel him to take action required under this subchapter, may be brought in the district court of the United States for the district where the plan has its principal office, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(l) Civil penalties on violations by fiduciaries

(1) In the case of –

(A) any breach of fiduciary responsibility under (or other violation of) part 4 of this subtitle by a fiduciary, or

(B) any knowing participation in such a breach or violation by any other person; the Secretary shall assess a civil penalty against such fiduciary or other person in an amount equal to 20 percent of the applicable recovery amount.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "applicable recovery amount" means any amount which is recovered from a fiduciary or other person with respect to a breach or violation described in paragraph (1) –

(A) pursuant to any settlement agreement with the Secretary, or

(B) ordered by a court to be paid by such fiduciary or other person to a plan or its participants and beneficiaries in a judicial proceeding instituted by the Secretary under subsection (a)(2) or (a)(5) of this section.

(3) The Secretary may, in the Secretary's sole discretion, waive or reduce the penalty under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines in writing that –

(A) the fiduciary or other person acted reasonably and in good faith, or

(B) it is reasonable to expect that the fiduciary or other person will not be able to restore all losses to the plan (or to provide the relief ordered pursuant to subsection (a)(9)) without severe financial hardship unless such waiver or reduction is granted.

(4) The penalty imposed on a fiduciary or other person under this subsection with respect to any transaction shall be reduced by the amount of any penalty or tax imposed on such fiduciary or other person with respect to such transaction under subsection (i) of this section and section 4975 of title 26.

(m) In the case of a distribution to a pension plan participant or beneficiary in violation of section 206(c) [29 U.S.C. 1056(e)] by a plan beneficiary, the Secretary shall assess a penalty against such fiduciary in an amount equal to the value of the distribution. Such penalty shall not exceed $10,000 for each such distribution.

APPENDIX K

29 U.S.C. § 1144 [ERISA]

29 U.S.C. § 1144 Other laws

(a) Supersedure; effective date

Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the provisions of this subchapter and subchapter III of this chapter shall supersede any and all State laws insofar as they may now or hereafter relate to any employee benefit plan described in section 1003(a) of this title and not exempt under section 1003(b) of this title. This section shall take effect on January 1, 1975.

(b) Construction and application

(1) This section shall not apply with respect to any cause of action which arose, or any act or omission which occurred, before January 1, 1975.

(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to exempt or relieve any person from any law of any State which regulates insurance, banking, or securities.

(B) Neither an employee benefit plan described in section 1003(a) of this title, which is not exempt under section 1003(b) of this title (other than a plan established primarily for the purpose of providing death benefits), nor any trust established under such a plan, shall be deemed to be an insurance company or other insurer, bank, trust company, or investment company or to be engaged in the business of insurance or banking for purposes of any law of any State purporting to regulate insurance companies, insurance contracts, banks, trust companies, or investment companies.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit use by the Secretary of services or facilities of a State agency as permitted under section 1136 of this title.

(4) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to any generally applicable criminal law of a State.

(5)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to the Hawaii Prepaid Health Care Act. (Haw. Rev. Stat. § 393-1 through 393-51).

(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to exempt from the subsection (a) of this section –

(i) any State tax law relating to employee benefit plans, or

(ii) any amendment of the Hawaii Prepaid Health Care Act enacted after September 2, 1974, to the extent it provides for more than the effective administration of such Act as in effect on such date.

(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), parts 1 and 4 of this subtitle, and the preceding sections of this part to the extent they govern matters which are governed by the provisions of such parts 1 and 4, shall supersede the Hawaii Prepaid Health Care Act (as in effect on or after January 14, 1983), but the Secretary may enter into cooperative arrangements under this paragraph and section 1136 of this title with officials of the State of Hawaii to assist them in effectuating the policies of provisions of such Act which are superseded by such parts 1 and 4 and the preceding sections of this part.

(6)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section –

(i) in the case of an employee welfare benefit plan which is a multiple employer welfare arrangement and is fully insured (or which is a multiple employer welfare arrangement subject to an exemption under subparagraph (B)), any law of any State which regulates insurance may apply to such arrangement to the extent that such law provides –

(I) standards requiring the maintenance of specified levels of reserves and specified levels of contributions, which any such plan, or any trust established under such a pian must meet in order to be considered under such law able to pay benefits in full when due, and

(II) provisions to enforce such standards, and

(ii) in the case of any other employee welfare benefit plan which is a multiple employer welfare arrangement, in addition to this subchapter, any law of any State which regulates insurance may apply to the extent not inconsistent with the preceding sections of this subchapter.

(B) The Secretary may, under regulations which may be prescribed by the Secretary, exempt from subparagraph (A)(ii), individually or by class, multiple employer welfare arrangements which are not fully insured. Any such exemption may be granted with respect to any arrangement or class of arrangements only if such arrangement or each arrangement which is

a member of such class meets the requirements of section 1002(1) and section 1003 of this title necessary to be considered an employee welfare benefit plan to which this subchapter applies.

(C) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall affect the manner or extent to which the provisions of this subchapter apply to an employee welfare benefit plan which is not a multiple employer welfare arrangement and which is a plan, fund, or program participating in, subscribing to or otherwise using a multiple employer welfare arrangement to fund or administer benefits to such plan's participants and beneficiaries.

(D) For purposes of this paragraph, a multiple employer welfare arrangement shall be considered fully insured only if the terms of the arrangement provide for benefits the amount of all of which the Secretary determines are guaranteed under a contract, or policy of insurance, issued by an insurance company, insurance service, or insurance organization, qualified to conduct business in a State.

(7) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to qualified domestic relations orders (within the meaning of section 1056(d)(3)(B)(i) of this title), qualified medical child support orders (within the meaning of section 609(a)(2)(A) [29 U.S.C. 1169(a)(2)(A)], and the provisions of law referred to in section 609(a)(2)(B)(ii) [29 U.S.C. 1169(a)(2)(B)(ii)] to the extent enforced by qualified medical child support orders.

(8) Subsection (a) of this section shall not be construed to preclude any State cause of action –

(A) with respect to which the State exercises its acquired rights under section 609(b)(3)

[29 U.S.C. 1169(b)(3)] with respect to a group health plan (as defined in section 607(l) [29 U.S.C. 1167(l)], or

(B) for recoupment of payment with respect to items or services pursuant to a State plan for medical assistance approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act [42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.] which would not have been payable if such acquired rights had been executed before payment with respect to such items or services by the group health plan.

(c) Definitions

For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "state law" includes all laws, decisions, rules, regulations, or other State action having the effect of law, of any State. A law of the United States applicable only to the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State law rather than a law of the United States.

(2) The term "state" includes a State, any political subdivisions thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of either, which purports to regulate, directly or indirectly, the terms and conditions of employee benefit plans covered by this subchapter.

(d) Alteration, amendment, modification, invalidation, impairment, or supersedure of any law of the United States prohibited

Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to alter, amend, modify, invalidate, impair, or supersede any law of the United States (except as provided in sections 1031 and 1137(c) of this title) or any rule or regulation issued under any such law.

APPENDIX L

REMAND ORDER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

LEAMINDA COKER,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	CIVIL
	§	ACTION
vs.	§	NO. H-93-1198
	§	
JAMES P. DOUGLAS, *et al.*,	§	
	§	(Filed
Defendants.	§	June 3, 1993)

REMAND ORDER

Plaintiff filed this action in state court in April 1990, alleging that "Shortly before her discharge on April 19, 1989, plaintiff discovered that the defendant trustees were approving and recommending loans from the IBEW Trust Fund to persons who were not eligible to receive the same as directed by the applicable rules and regulations governing the Fund. When the plaintiff was ordered, and refused, to process the illegal loans she was discharged by the defendants, who gave her fabricated untrue reasons for her discharge." In February 1993, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint asserting that "In the fall of 1988, plaintiff discovered that the defendant trustees were approving and recommending Unemployment Hardship Loans from the IBEW Trust Fund to persons who were not eligible to receive the same as directed by the applicable rules and regulations set forth in Exhibit F [copy of the Pension Plan]. As Administrator, plaintiff was required to assist the trustees by processing the illegal loans: when plaintiff refused and attempted to

stop the illegal loans, she was discharged by the defendants who gave her fabricated untrue reasons for her discharge." In March 1993, Plaintiff responded to discovery requests regarding which laws support her claim by producing a photocopy of a federal statute. On April 22, 1993, Defendants filed their notice of removal. The case is now before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Remand.

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and removal statutes are construed under a strict construction analysis. *See Powers v. South Central United Food and Commercial Workers Unions*, 719 F.2d 760, 762 (5th Cir. 1983). Plaintiff's claim is based exclusively on the Texas Supreme Court decision *Sabine Pilot Service, Inc. v. Hauck*, 687 S.W.2d 733 (Tex. 1985) which created an exception to the employment-at-will doctrine where an employee is discharged for refusing to commit an illegal act. The Court notes that the employee in *Sabine* was terminated for refusing to pump the bilges of his vessel at a place where it was prohibited by federal law. *Hauck v. Sabine Pilots, Inc.*, 672 S.W.2d 322, 323 (Tex. App. – Beaumont 1984). In the case at bar, the illegal act which Plaintiff alleges precipitated her discharge is a violation of both Texas law and federal law. The Courts finds that Plaintiff's cause of action does not arise under federal law. The federal issues, if any, are "collateral in nature, and are not substantial in relation to the claim as a whole, which is in essence one under state law." *Willy v. Coastal Corp.*, 855 F.2d 1160, 1171 (5th Cir. 1988) (cause of action for wrongful discharge under *Sabine* for refusal to violate state and federal law).

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Remand (Entry #3) is GRANTED and this case is REMANDED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction to the 164th Judicial District Court of Harris County.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Costs and Expenses is DENIED.

SIGNED this 3rd day of June, 1993, at Houston, Texas.

/s/ Norman W. Black
NORMAN W. BLACK
CHIEF JUDGE

APPENDIX M

EXCERPTS FROM DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO REMAND AND REQUEST FOR COSTS AND EXPENSES IN FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

LEAMINDA COKER, Plaintiff, vs. JAMES P. DOUGLAS, A.A. COOK, RAY WILLIAMS, GEORGE E. SUMROW, CLIFFORD HENDERSON, CHARLES MELTON, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS TRUSTEES OF THE IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, IBEW PENSION TRUST FUND LOCAL 716, AND INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 716, Defendants.	§ § § § § § § § § § § § § § § §	CIVIL ACTION NO. H-93-1198

EXCERPTS FROM DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO REMAND AND REQUEST FOR COSTS AND EXPENSES IN FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT

Defendants James P. Douglas, A.A. Cook, Ray Williams, George E. Sumrow, Clifford Henderson, Charles Melton, IBEW Pension Trust Fund Local 716 ("the Fund"), and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 716 ("the Union") oppose Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and Request for Costs and Expenses as follows:

* * *

On March 26, 1993, in response to an interrogatory propounded by the Fund (the Fund's interrogatory, and Coker's response, is attached as Exhibit 2) to discover precisely what law she claimed she had been commanded to violate, Coker identified 18 U.S.C. § 664, a federal criminal statute which provides:

> Any person who embezzles, steals, or unlawfully and willfully abstracts or converts to his own use or to the use of another, any of the moneys, funds, securities, premiums, credits, property, or other assets of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or of any fund connected therewith, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.
>
> As used in this section, the term "any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan" means any employee benefit plan subject to any provision of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

On April 22, 1993, because Coker's interrogatory response established that her right to relief necessarily depends on the resolution of a substantial question of federal law, Defendants removed the matter to this Court. Coker now seeks remand of the lawsuit to state court.

* * *

Coker's central argument in her Motion to Remand is that any construction of 18 U.S.C. § 664 is merely "collateral" to her underlying claim and that, therefore, her case does not "arise under" federal law. It is well settled, however, that where an essential element of a plaintiff's claim turns on a right or immunity created by federal law,

and where that claim is such that it will be supported if the federal law is given one construction or effect, and defeated if given another, federal subject matter jurisdiction exists and removal is proper. *Gully v. First National Bank in Meridian*, 299 U.S. 109, 112-13. *See also Franchise Tax Board v. Construction Laborers Vacation Trust*, 461 U.S. 1, 27-28 (1983); *Maxwell v. First National Bank of Monroeville*, 638 F.2d 32, 35 (5th Cir. 1981). Coker's reliance on 18 U.S.C. § 664 meets these criteria and therefore, the federal issues implicated by her action cannot be characterized as collateral or incidental.

Coker's articulated cause of action relies on *Sabine Pilot Service, Inc. v. Hauck*, 687 S.W. 2d 733 (Tex. 1985), in which the Supreme Court of Texas determined that the sole public policy exception to the employment-at-will doctrine in Texas prohibits an employer from discharging an employee for refusing to obey a criminally unlawful order. *Id.* at 735. Simply stated, the essence of Coker's claim is that, because 18 U.S.C. § 664 imposed under her a duty – the breach of which would subject her to criminal penalties – not to commit certain acts allegedly commanded by her employer, she has the right to refuse to comply with certain directives from her employer without being subjected to discharge for so refusing. Because *Sabine Pilot* makes clear that a plaintiff bears the burden of proving that her discharge was "for no reason other than her refusal to perform an *illegal act*," *Id.* (emphasis added), the resolution of whether the acts Coker was allegedly commanded to perform did, in fact, violate the statute, is essential to her cause of action.

* * *

In her motion to remand, Coker alludes to a Texas criminal statute, Tex. Penal Code Sec. 32.45, with which Coker supplemented her response to the Fund's interrogatory, three days after Defendants' Notice of Removal.

* * *

As the second paragraph of 18 U.S.C. § 664 states, "the term 'any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan' means any employee benefit plan subject to any provision of Title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974." Added as an amendment to the pre-existing first paragraph of the statute in September 1974, this paragraph brings the statute within the all-encompassing scope of ERISA and Constitutes an admission by Coker – when she expressly identifies it as the law which would allegedly have been violated had she obeyed her employer's alleged commands – that her claims relate to employee benefit plans governed by federal law. Consequently, to the extent a state statute purports to define unlawful conduct with respect to the administration of such plans, it is superseded by the comprehensive regulatory scheme fashioned by Congress in ERISA. *Pilot Life Insurance v. Dedeaux*, 481 U.S. 41, 46 (1987); *See also, Ingersoll-Rand Co. v. McClendon*, 498 U.S. 133 (1990).

* * *

Therefore, Coker's Motion to Remand should be denied and the Court should establish a Docket Control Order governing this case at its earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Stuart B. Johnson, Jr.
STUART B. JOHNSTON, JR.
Texas Bar No. 10846280
ROBERT L. IVEY
Texas Bar No. 10438700
1001 Fannin
2805 First City Tower
Houston, Texas 77002-6760
(713) 758-2426
(713) 758-2346 (FAX)

OF COUNSEL:

VINSON & ELKINS L.L.P.
1001 Fannin
2500 First City Tower
Houston, Texas 77002-6760

/s/ Patrick M. Flynn
PATRICK M. FLYNN
Texas Bar No. 07199200
1235 North Loop West,
Suite 1235
Houston, Texas 77008
(713) 861-6163
(713) 861-2568 (FAX)

APPENDIX N

COKER'S JOB DESCRIPTION (ATTACHED TO COKER'S APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF ERROR IN THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT AS APPENDIX)

COKER'S JOB DESCRIPTION (ATTACHED TO COKER'S APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF ERROR IN THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT AS APPENDIX 2)

* * *

employ such agents, attorneys, actuaries, auditors, or administrative or clerical assistants as they may deem advisable.

6.3 Rules and Decisions: All rules and decisions of the Trustees shall be uniformly and consistently applied to all Employees in similar circumstances. Any rule or decision of the Trustees which is not inconsistent with the provisions of the Plan shall be conclusive and binding upon all persons affected by it, except as may be otherwise provided by federal law.

6.4 Functions of Administrative Agent: The functions of the Administrative Agent shall be:

(a) To receive and deposit with the Custodian, on behalf of the Trustees, all contributions made by the Employers;

(b) To notify each delinquent Employer and the Trustees as to such Employer's delinquency in payment of contributions;

(c) To record each Employer's contributions in a ledger for that Employer;

(d) To record the hours worked within each calendar quarter by each Employee, for which hours contributions are made by Employers;

(e) To maintain a file of designation of beneficiary cards;

(f) To pay benefits as directed by the Trustees;

(g) To prepare reports as directed by the Trustees, and

(h) To otherwise assist the Trustees in the administration of the Plan.

6.5 Authorization of Benefit Payments: The Trustees shall issue directions to the Administrative Agent concerning all benefits which are to be paid from the Fund pursuant to the provisions of the Plan. The Administrative Agent shall keep on file, in such manner as it may deem convenient or proper, all directions from the Trustees. If, in the Trustees' judgment, any person to whom a benefit is payable is unable to care for his affairs because of illness, injury, or other incapacity, the Trustees may authorize his benefit to be paid to any person who, or institution which, in the Trustees' judgment, is caring for the person entitled to the benefit, or to any member of his family, or the Trustees may apply it directly for his benefit.

6.6 Employee Data: Each Employee and Employer shall from time to time furnish the Trustees and Administrative Agent with such data as may be considered necessary by the Trustees to administer the Plan. Each Employer shall fully cooperate with the Trustees and Administrative Agent in the administration of the Plan.

6.7 Eligibility Procedures: As a condition of his right to receive a benefit hereunder, each eligible Employee shall, in addition to fulfilling the eligibility requirements specified in Article IV, fulfill

* * *